

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DAT	TE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/600,583	06/23/2003		Michael Peter Germeraad		5505		
7590 06/28/2005			EXAM	INER			
Michael Germ		JONES, SCOTT E					
14606 Horseshoe Dr. Saratoga, CA 95070				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				3713			
				DATE MAIL ED: 06/28/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)	<i>SI</i>			
		10/600,5		GERMERAAD, MICHAEL PETER				
Office Action Summary		Examine		Art Unit				
		Scott E. J	ones	3713				
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this commun	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
A SHO THE M - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI sions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commoeriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply sply received by the Office later than three months a d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evi nunication. 0) days, a reply within the star atutory period will apply and w will, by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tin tutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from olication to become ABANDONE	nety filed rs will be considered timel the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2003.							
3) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the apta of the above claim(s) is/accclaim(s) is/accclaim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	re withdrawn from co						
Applicati	on Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the fine drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objected to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or b ction to the drawing(s) the correction is requi	be held in abeyance. Se red if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 Cl				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Fination Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/600,583

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the multiple-sided video display system comprising a mounting enclosure containing two or more individual video display screens must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the

Page 3

Art Unit: 3713

renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as being a single step method claim. The clause in each claim simply recites a single step in a process. A process claim requires that a series of steps be performed. Therefore, Claims 2 and 3 are "single step method" claim that requires additional steps to be placed in proper form. Please see MPEP § 2164.08(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki (Re. 35,819).

Art Unit: 3713

Suzuki discloses a simulated horse race game that presents a race on a video display system, wherein each player has an individual monitor that is in communication with a game control system via hard wired or wireless communication. Suzuki discloses:

Regarding Claim 1:

A multiple sided video display system (Figure 1) comprising, a mounting enclosure (2), containing two or more individual video display screens (5) oriented at angles so that one and only one individual display screen thereon can be seen by an individual positioned in front of the individual display screen, and so that the face and upper body of all individuals positioned in front of the individual display screens can see each other individual positioned in front of the individual display screens (Abstract, Figures 1, 4, and 6a-6c, and Column 1, line 33-Column 2, line 4).

Regarding Claim 2:

displaying video broadcast content, internet content, or pre-recorded content utilizing
 a multiple sided video display system (Abstract, Figures 1, 4, and 6a-6c, and Column
 line 33-Column 2, line 4).

Regarding Claim 3:

• displaying computer games utilizing a multiple sided video display system (Abstract, Figures 1, 4, and 6a-6c, and Column 1, line 33-Column 2, line 4).

Regarding Claim 4:

• the video display system is electronically or optically connected via wireless or wired connections to a computer game controller (Abstract, Figures 1, 4, and 6a-6c, and Column 1, line 33-Column 2, line 4).

Application/Control Number: 10/600,583 Page 5

Art Unit: 3713

Regarding Claim 5:

 the video display system is electronically or optically connected via a wireless or wired connections to a video display computer, broadcast receiver, or pre-recorded content player (Abstract, Figures 1, 4, and 6a-6c, and Column 1, line 33-Column 2, line 4).

Regarding Claim 8:

• the number of video display devices is greater than four (Abstract, Figures 1, 4, and 6a-6c, and Column 1, line 33-Column 2, line 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (Re. 35,819).

Suzuki discloses that as discussed above with regards to claims 1-5 and 8. Suzuki lacks explicitly disclosing having three video display devices as recited in claim 6 and having four video display devices as recited in claim 7. However, since Suzuki discloses a video game display device having more than four individual displays, it would have been a matter of design choice to design Suzuki's system with three or four individual video displays rather than the number of individual video displays shown in figure 1.

Art Unit: 3713

Conclusion

Page 6

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

• Sato et al. '870, Kusuda et al. '360, '991, '619, and '126, Tomaru et al. '401, Nagao et al. '898, Nakagawa et al. '369, Schaaij '640, and Galyean, III et al. '396 disclose games using multiple display screens in a game system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott E. Jones whose telephone number is (571) 272-4438. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott E. Jones Primary Examiner Art Unit 3713

sej